

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

DAVID KROUSE,)	CASE NO. 3:05 CV 7346
)	
Plaintiff,)	JUDGE DAVID A. KATZ
)	
v.)	
)	<u>OPINION AND ORDER</u>
STATE OF OHIO,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

On August 23, 2005, plaintiff pro se David Krouse filed this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action against the State of Ohio. The complaint asserts that various Ohio statutes concerning minors violate the Constitution. For the reasons stated below, this action is dismissed.

Principles requiring generous construction of pro se pleadings are not without limits. Beaudett v. City of Hampton, 775 F.2d 1274, 1277 (4th Cir. 1985). Given the most liberal construction, the complaint does not contain allegations remotely suggesting plaintiff might have a valid federal claim, or setting forth a reasonable basis for jurisdiction. This action is therefore appropriately subject to summary dismissal. Apple v. Glenn, 183 F.3d 477 (6th Cir. 1999); see Hagans v. Lavine, 415 U.S. 528, 536-37 (1974)(citing numerous Supreme Court cases for the proposition that attenuated or unsubstantial claims divest the district court of jurisdiction); In re Bendectin Litig., 857 F.2d 290, 300 (6th Cir.1988)(recognizing that federal question jurisdiction is divested by

unsubstantial claims).

Accordingly, this action is dismissed.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ DAVID A. KATZ 10/4/05

DAVID A. KATZ
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE